

Please AMEND the Application as follows:

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please AMEND the following claims:

RE: Claim 1

DISC 7 1. (Amended Three Times) A network client, comprising:

a scanner component accessing an input content stream representing at least a layout source document via a network connection to extract renderable content from said layout source document;

a parsing component coupled to said scanner component for parsing said renderable content, said renderable content containing both malformed and well-formed expressions; and

a replaceable document type definition component configured to control said parsing component based on a particular layout document type definition corresponding to a particular grammar to transform said renderable content into well-formed objects to be processed by a content model based on said particular grammar, said replaceable document type definition component being replaceable during execution of said network client, said replaceable document type definition component permitting said renderable content to be rendered.

REMARKS

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed November 6, 2001. Per this paper, claims 1-21, as amended, remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration. Consideration of the amendments and remarks along with allowance of all pending claims (1-21, as amended) are earnestly solicited.

Submitted contemporaneously herewith is a Petition for a Three (3) Month Extension of Time to extend the period for response to May 6, 2002. The Petition is submitted in triplicate along with all appropriate fees. A grant of the Petition is respectfully requested.

The following remarks address the merits of the Office Action that require response.

1. Re Drawings:

At paragraph 4 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner requires submission of formal drawings.

Such formal drawings will be submitted upon allowance of the Application.

2. Claim Objections:

At paragraph 6 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the Examiner's objection of the same.

Accordingly, it is earnestly requested that the Examiner's object be withdrawn.

3. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102:

At paragraph 7 on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-6 under 35 USC §102(e) allegedly as being anticipated by Glass et al (U.S. Patent 6,253,204).

The Applicant respectfully TRAVERSES the Examiner's rejection and asserts the following remarks:

The Glass et al. patent is directed to systems and methods for correcting broken hypertext links (e.g., hypertext links that are supposed to lead to navigated content, but don't) in the context of websites. Such broken links often are displayed within a running browser application as "file not found" error messages within the context of a web session. The Glass et al. systems and methods utilize spider or content crawling techniques to navigate to content that may be displayed within a browser to heal a broken link. See e.g., Glass et al. at cols. 5 and 6, lines 35-70 and 1-30, respectively. Generally speaking, Glass et al. is concerned with providing

traversable links to web documents when originally intended links lead to “unavailable” documents. See Glass et al. at col. 4, lines 41-45.

In great contrast to Glass et al., the present invention is directed to apparatuses and methods for rendering and laying out content based on replaceable document type definitions. Furthermore, the present invention allows malformed expressions (e.g., HTML markup expressions that are not properly formed – such as those that are missing HTML markers and constructs) to be reformatted on the fly and manifested within a browser based on a particular document type definition. And, the present invention permits content not previously seen or known by a running browser to be displayed and otherwise manifested through use of run-time replaceable document type definitions that correspond to a particular content type. The present invention is not directed to correcting broken hypertext links that appear within well-known HTML type documents to LOCATE displayable content as taught by Glass et al. – Instead, the present invention is concerned with content ensuring effective and proper content RENDERING and LAYOUT after content has already been located.

The novel features of the present invention are found in the claims such as in amended claim 1 wherein a replaceable document type definition component is “configured to control said parsing component based on a particular layout document type definition corresponding to a particular grammar to transform said renderable content into well-formed objects to be processed by a content model based on said particular grammar, said replaceable document type definition component being replaceable during execution of said network client, said replaceable document type definition component permitting said renderable content to be rendered.” Claim 1, as amended, at lines 7-12. Dependent claims 2-6 contain such features by way of their dependency on claim 1.

Accordingly, claims 1-6, as amended, are clearly and patentably distinct from the Glass et al. patent. Thus, the rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 USC § 102(e) based on the Glass et al. patent must be withdrawn, which action is respectfully requested, such that claims 1-6 are allowed to issue in a U.S. Patent.

4. Claims Rejections – 35 USC § 103:

At paragraph 9, spanning pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 7-21 under 35 USC § 103(a) allegedly as being unpatentable over Glass et al. (discussed above) in view of Nakao (U.S. No. 6,061,697). The Examiner's stated reasons for rejection are found within the Office Action and are hereby incorporated by reference.

The Applicant respectfully TRAVERSES the Examiner's rejection and asserts the following remarks:

The Applicant's remarks regarding the Glass et al patent as presented above with regard to the Examiner's 35 USC § 102 rejection of claims 1-6, apply here with equal force and are hereby incorporated by reference.

The Examiner's own statements regarding the Glass et al. patent demonstrate a clear and present misunderstanding of the claimed invention. According to the Examiner, "Glass teaches the parsing and modification of a HTML document, to replace a broken link with an attribute representing the accessible status of the link, and the display or manifestation of the *fixed* HTML document..." The Examiner's interpretation could not be farther from the teaching of Glass et al. – correction of broken hypertext links – period. Glass et al. does not teach nothing of preparing a "fixed HTML document." Glass et al. is not concerned with rendering content, but instead with LOCATING content to be displayed.

The deficiencies of the GLASS et al. patent are not made up for by the Nakao patent. So, by no twisted or tortured reading of the Glass et al. patent in combination with the Nakao patent would one of ordinary skill in the art have derived the claimed invention as defined by claims 7-21, which claims and their language are hereby incorporated by reference.

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, it is earnestly requested that the Examiner's rejection be withdrawn and that claims 7-21 be allowed to issue in a U.S. Patent.

Conclusions

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed November 6, 2001. Per this paper, claims 1-21, as amended, remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration. Consideration of the amendments and remarks along with allowance of all pending claims (1-21, as amended) are earnestly solicited.

Submitted contemporaneously herewith is a Petition for a Three (3) Month Extension of Time to extend the period for response to May 6, 2002. The Petition is submitted in triplicate along with all appropriate fees. A grant of the Petition is respectfully requested.

If it is believed that an in-person or telephonic interview will in any way expedite the handling of this paper, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney of record.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON, LLP

By: Erik B. Cherdak
USPTO Reg. No. 39,936

Date: 5-6-02
11300 Rockville Pike, Suite 906
Rockville, Maryland 20852
(301) 984-4700, FAX (301) 984-7696
email: erik@ctpatents.com

APPENDIX

1. (Amended Three Times) A network client, comprising:

a scanner component accessing an input content stream representing at least a layout source document via a network connection to extract renderable content from said layout source document;

a parsing component coupled to said scanner component for parsing said renderable content, said renderable content containing both malformed and well-formed expressions; and

a replaceable document type definition component configured to control said parsing component based on a particular layout document type definition corresponding to a particular grammar to transform said renderable content into well-formed objects to be processed by a content model based on said particular grammar, said replaceable document type definition component being replaceable during execution of said network client, said replaceable document type definition component permitting said renderable content to be rendered.